

RECEIVED

20

OCT 26 1999

MR. KRAFT: I am Steven Kraft. I am the

21

Director of Spent Nuclear Fuel Management, the Nuclear Energy

22

Institute, the Washington-based policy organization for the

ESQUIRE DEPOSITION SERVICES

)

1 nuclear energy industry. I am honored to be here to  
1... 2 represent my industry. [I have provided my full statement for  
3 the record. We support going forward with the Yucca Mountain  
4 project.] DOE, everyone in this room, knows by now of the  
5 dispute that the utilities have with the Department of Energy  
6 and the federal government over the removal of spent fuel  
7 from our sites, which should have begun in 1998. I am not  
8 going to go through those details.

9 MR. LAWSON: Excuse me, sir. I'm going to  
10 interrupt you for a second. As I announced earlier, any  
11 necessary, and I add, any unnecessary conversations, please  
12 hold outside so there's no disturbance at all. Sorry to  
13 interrupt.

14 MR. KRAFT: You have heard a lot about the  
15 numbers in the Draft EIS today. And I am not going to repeat  
1 cont. 16 them. You know them far better than I do. [You also know  
17 that based upon any reasonable comparisons, going forward  
18 with the Yucca Mountain site is the right thing to do, doing  
19 so supported by a large body of scientific evidence, first  
20 published in the viability assessment and now in the  
21 Environmental Impact Statement.] There is one point, however,  
2... 22 [the EIS far overstates, the risk associated with

2 cont.

1 transportation.

2 Any individual who may be harmed by the  
3 radioactive nature of the shipment in the maximum,  
4 reasonable, foreseeable transportation accident is in fact  
5 far more likely to be struck by a meteor than to be harmed by  
6 that accident. But I think everyone would agree that this  
7 discussion, while we can argue about the numbers, is really  
8 much more about the future and much more about our children.  
9 Everyone would agree with that.

10 My two, second grader, fourth grade are  
11 currently in school in Montgomery County. I learned from the  
12 web site the other day they are within five miles of  
13 potential high-level waste shipping ground. You know, I  
14 talked with my wife, and on a comparative risk basis we are  
15 far more concerned about what their future is going to be  
16 like and the quality of air that they are going to breathe  
17 than the potential for the extremely unlikely transportation  
18 accident happening within five miles of their school. As we  
19 watch our children grow and inherit the world from us, they  
20 will need energy, and they will need clean air. Nuclear  
21 energy can provide both. The nation needs to move forward  
22 with the Yucca Mountain project. Thank you.